

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 20-21 stand newly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Yokoyama in view of newly cited U.S. patent 3,184,076 (Brown et al). According to the Office Action, Yokoyama discloses all of the claimed features other than a plurality of classes of cranes, but that this is taught in Brown et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As was explained in the last response, the range of commonality or standardization for a family of cranes according to the invention is limited (page 16, lines 1-10). The commonality of the common rotating frame is limited to a given class, and is based on the specifications of the model of that class having the largest lifting capacity. However, the rotating frame for each respective class is different from the rotating frames of all of the other classes. One can therefore avoid the problem of a small capacity model having a too large rotating frame, with its attendant cost increase.

Yokoyama describes (column 4, lines 51-59) that various devices can be used in common for different lifting capacities of working machines. The Office Action recognizes that it does not teach plural classes of cranes, wherein the rotating frame is common within each class but differs between classes. According to the Office Action, this would nonetheless have been obvious in view of the description in Brown et al that cranes may “be constructed in many different sizes and styles.” According to the Office Action, the light weight and heavier capacity type cranes taught in Brown et al comprise different “classes,” each of which could have the common specifications of Yokoyama.

As a threshold matter, it is respectfully submitted that the assertion in the Office Action that the claimed feature whereby “the common rotating frame of each respective class [has] specifications based on the model of that class having the largest lifting capacity” is

taught at lines 15-19 of column 4 of Yokoyama is respectfully traversed. This portion of the reference simply describes that higher capacity winches should be used of a crane of a given lifting capacity. It does not teach that the rotating frame should have the specification based on a crane having the largest lifting capacity.

In any case, the acknowledgement in Brown et al that cranes may comprise both light weight and heavier capacity types would not have rendered it obvious to have provided a family of cranes wherein all of the models included in each respective class share a common rotating frame, the common rotating frame of each respective class having specifications based on the model of that class having the largest lifting capacity, and the rotating frame for each respective class is different from the rotating frames of all of the other classes.


For example, the noted description in Brown et al teaches nothing more than that which is already taught in Yokoyama, i.e., that cranes can have different capacities. This does not require, however, that the commonality taught in Yokoyama should be limited such that the lighter capacity cranes must have different rotating frames than the heavier capacity cranes, nor does it teach that rotating frame of the light weight or heavier capacity cranes, if the same, should have specifications based on a crane having the largest lifting capacity. Therefore, no combination of Yokoyama and Brown et al would teach the limited commonality recited in the claims.

Claims 22-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Yokoyama in view of Brown et al and Harrison et al, wherein Harrison et al was cited to teach the winch mounting arrangement of the dependent claims. However, since Harrison et al does not overcome the shortcomings of Yokoyama and Brown et al with respect to Claim 20, the dependent Claims 22-27 are believed to define over any combination of the cited references.

Applicants therefore believe that the present application is in a condition for allowance and respectfully solicit an early Notice of Allowability.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Robert T. Pous  
Registration No. 29,099  
Attorney of Record

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)

I:\ATTY\RTPL\293196US-AM.doc